

The definitive version of this chapter is published as:

Seedhouse, Interaction and Constructs, in *Language Learning and Teaching as Social Inter-action*, edited by Dr Zhu Hua, Dr Paul Seedhouse, Professor Vivian Cook and Professor Li Wei, Palgrave MacMillan, 2007.

[CN]2

[CT]Interaction and Constructs

[au]Paul Seedhouse

[aff] Newcastle University

[A]Introduction

There is currently considerable interest in the relationship between Conversation Analysis (CA) and sociocultural or Social Constructionist (SC) approaches to language learning. This chapter analyses extracts of L2 classroom interaction to discover the extent to which SC constructs may or may not be manifest in the details of the interaction. If such constructs are evident, then how are they talked into being and how are they organized in interactional terms? Do they provide an adequate account of language learning in the L2 classroom?

First, some introduction to SC and CA is provided. The late 1990s saw a debate on a proposed ‘re-conceptualization’ of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) (Firth and Wagner 1997, 1998; Gass 1998; Kasper 1997; Long 1997; Markee 2000; van Lier 2000). Some of the criticisms which Firth and Wagner (1997, 1998) made of SLA are as follows: SLA had neglected the social and contextual aspects of language use and their contribution to SLA processes. SLA was becoming a ‘hermetically sealed area of study’ (1998: 92) which was losing contact with sociology, sociolinguistics and

discourse analysis in favour of a psycholinguistic focus on the cognition of the individual. There was an etic rather than emic¹ approach to fundamental concepts. The traditional SLA database was too narrow. Essentially the call was for a holistic approach which includes the social dimension and emic perspectives. Responses to Firth and Wagner (Gass 1998; Kasper 1997; Long 1997) generally suggested that, whilst CA was interesting, it had little or nothing to say about language learning or acquisition.

Since Firth and Wagner's (1997) article, a number of studies have been published which do incorporate social and contextual dimensions (e.g., Hall and Verplaetse 2000; Lantolf 2000; Ohta 2001) and which have established a school of sociocultural theory (SC) within SLA, based primarily on Vygotskian concepts. SC explores the interconnection of learning, language, interaction and society and offers a 'holistic perspective of language learning, where individual and social merge into one and where use and knowledge are indistinguishable' (Ellis and Barkhuizen 2005: 229). Deriving from psychology, SC tends to work top-down from Vygotskian cognitive constructs such as the *Zone of Proximal Development* (ZPD).

Deriving from sociology, Conversation Analysis (CA) is a methodology for the analysis of naturally occurring spoken interaction. CA practitioners aim 'to discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus on how sequences of action are generated' (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 14). CA always works bottom-up from data and is in principle agnostic in relation to learning theories. CA distinguishes between an 'etic' or external analyst's perspective on human behaviour and an 'emic' or participant's perspective and aims to develop an emic perspective. What CA means by an emic perspective, however, is the

participant's perspective within the interactional environment in which the talk occurs.

At interest in this chapter is the extent to which CA and SC can be combined. Is CA able to provide evidence in relation to the process of learning and show how SC constructs are talked into being?

[A]Conceptions of CA in language learning and teaching research

A number of publications since 1997 have therefore tried to establish what CA might be able to contribute to the study of language learning. Opinion is currently divided as to the relationship between CA and language learning and the status of CA. At the time of writing there are a number of competing and sometimes conflicting conceptions of how CA may or may not be employed in language learning and teaching research. From a temporal perspective, this lack of clarity is not a matter of major concern. CA itself only emerged in the 1960s, had no connection with learning and in its genesis dealt exclusively with monolingual English data (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974; Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977). It is only in the period 2000–04 that publications have started to address the relationship between CA and language learning,² culminating in the special issue of the *Modern Language Journal* in 2004 (Markee and Kasper 2004). Seedhouse (2005) suggests that it now makes sense to identify two different approaches to the application of CA to the broad field of language learning and teaching.

In the *ethnomethodological CA approach*, data from language learning and teaching settings are approached in exactly the same way as any other data, following the principles and procedures described in introductions such as Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998), ten Have (1999) and Seedhouse (2004). If it is evident in the details

of the interaction that the participants are orienting to language learning in some way, then it is legitimate to invoke this in the analysis. For example, Koshik (2002) reveals how teachers use the pedagogical practice of designedly incomplete utterances in order to initiate self-correction by learners. The analysis is not linked to any learning theory and Koshik states (2002: 278) that her aim 'is not to evaluate the pedagogy but to describe an institutional practice, showing how practices of ordinary conversation can be adapted for specialized institutional tasks.'

This approach would argue that the very strength of applying CA to the field of language learning and teaching lies in the fact that it is neutral and agnostic in relation to learning theories and teaching methods and reveals an emic perspective. Unless it is evident that interactants are themselves orienting to a construct, it is not legitimate to invoke it in an *a priori* fashion. Therefore, linking CA to any theory of learning in abstraction from a specific interactional environment is an inherently etic undertaking.

The *sociocultural theory approach to CA* is currently attracting a great deal of interest as it has the potential to offer a systematic approach of how to study the process of second language learning. This approach seeks 'to use CA techniques as methodological tools that are in the service of different sociocultural theories of learning' (Markee and Kasper 2004: 495). Mondada and Pekarek Doehler outline the significant similarities between CA and sociocultural theory in a strong socio-interactionist perspective: 'both of these frameworks converge in insisting on the central role of contextually embedded communicative processes in the accomplishment of human actions and identities as well as of social facts' (2004: 504).

Young and Miller (2004), Brouwer and Wagner (2004) and Mondada and Pekarek Doehler (2004) propose to link a sociocultural view of development with a

CA perspective on interaction. They apply to their data the notion of situated learning ‘according to which learning is rooted in the learner’s participation in social practice and continuous adaptation to the unfolding circumstances and activities that constitute talk-in-interaction’ (Mondada and Pekarek Doehler 2004: 501). Young and Miller (2004) conduct a longitudinal observation of revision talk, show that the participation framework changed over time and reveal the processes by which the student moved from peripheral to fuller participation. Brouwer and Wagner (2004) suggest moving away from the typical SLA conception of language in terms of individual cognition and an input-output approach to the acquisition of discrete linguistic (typically syntactic or lexical) items. They propose instead to focus on the development of interactional skills and resources and conceptualizing language learning as a social process. They suggest that ‘learning is situated; learning is social; and knowledge is located in communities of practice’ and that ‘learning not only takes place in the social world, it also constitutes that world’ (Brouwer and Wagner 2004: 33).

The field of CA-for-SLA (Markee 2000) generally falls within this approach. The main difference with the previous approach is that the sociocultural theory approach to CA employs CA as a tool in the service of a theory of learning whereas ethnomethodological CA does not and is agnostic in relation to learning.

[A]Data analysis

In this section I analyse extracts of L2 classroom interaction to examine the extent to which SC constructs may or may not be manifest in the details of the interaction. I also attempt to illustrate some of the issues and concepts previously discussed. A CA analysis would normally cover the areas described in Seedhouse (2004). Here, I do

not present the initial stages because of space constraints. However, see Seedhouse (2004: 59–64) for a full analysis of data similar to Extract 1.

[C]*Extract 1*

(The teacher has been asking learners to talk about their favourite movies)

[numbered transcription (NT): line space above and below, number full out, em space then ‘speaker’, em space then first word, turnovers aligned with first word. Retain all interline alignments. Follow this throughout all chapters]

- 1 L: Kung Fu.
- 2 T: Kung Fu? you like the movie Kung Fu?
- 3 L: yeah ... fight.
- 4 T: that was about a great fighter? ... a man who knows how to
 fight with this hands.
- 5 L: I fight ... my hand.
- 6 T: you know how to fight with your hands?
- 7 L: I fight with my hand.
- 8 T: do you know karate?
- 9 L: I know karate.
- 10 T: watch out guys, Wang knows karate.

(Johnson 1995: 24)

[NT end]

The analysis will be divided into three stages. *First*, what can we say about the learner’s actual developmental level or current ability in L2? We can note in lines 3 and 5 that his grammatical resources are fairly limited. Nonetheless, the learner is able to make use of these limited resources to nominate a sub-topic (line 1), to develop the

sub-topic (line 3) and to turn the discussion to his own fighting abilities (line 5).

Although it can be challenging for children to interact with the teacher in a classroom setting, even in the L1, we can see that L is able to use the turn-taking and sequence organizations of the L2 proficiently. L constantly needs to analyse T's turns. From the learner's perspective, it is not just a matter of understanding the propositional content of what T says in the L2; it is also a matter of analysing what social and sequential action T is performing and what an appropriate social and sequential action in response would be. So we can see that L skilfully manages to co-construct meaning with T in the L2 from his limited grammatical resources.

Second, what can we say about the learning environment in terms of input to the language learning process and facilitation of upgrading as a result of the interaction? Line 6 reads: 'you know how to fight with your hands?' In CA terms this is known as embedded correction (Jefferson 1987: 95); that is, a correction done as a by-the-way occurrence in the context of a social action. We will break its contribution down into four points. First, the utterance places the sequence within the teacher's overall pedagogical plan for the lesson, which 'Was to allow the students to share their ideas and possibly generate some new vocabulary words within the context of the discussion' (Johnson 1995: 23). Second, it may promote positive affect and motivation in that the teacher engages with the ideas and personal meanings which the learner chooses to share and produces the conversational action of a confirmation check which validates the utterance. Line 6 also displays interest in the learner's extra-curricular abilities. It then demonstrates confidence in the learner by returning the floor to him with the question. Third, it makes it possible for the other learners in the class to follow the topic of the interaction (the others are explicitly addressed in line 10) and to receive correctly formed linguistic input. There is no evidence in the

transcripts as to whether the other learners have done so or not. However, Ohta (2001) shows (by recording and transcribing the private talk of individually microphoned students in a classroom) that students *are capable* of using recasts in which they are not personally involved as negative evidence and of displaying uptake in their private talk. Fourth, and most importantly, there is positive evaluation of the propositional content of the learner utterance followed by an expansion of the learner utterance into a correct sequence of linguistic forms or embedded correction. In terms of input, the teacher provides a corrected version of the learner's turn in line 5 whilst retaining a focus on meaning. As Johnson (1995: 25) points out, this form of correction and expansion is highly reminiscent of adult-child conversation.

Third, what evidence is there of SC constructs in the detail of the interaction? The technique being used by the teacher in line 6 is often termed *scaffolding* (Johnson 1995: 75; Ohta 2005: 506) from a SC perspective. The SLA literature terms this action a recast and the instance in line 6 conforms to Long and colleagues' (1998: 358) definition of recasts.

Ohta defines Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) in relation to SLA in the following terms: 'For the L2 learner, the ZPD is the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by individual linguistic production, and the level of potential development as determined through language produced collaboratively with a teacher or peer' (Ohta 2001: 9). What we can see in this extract, then, is how a ZPD is talked into being through the organization of the interaction. Specifically, we see a neat juxtaposition of the learner's actual developmental level in line 3 (yeah ... fight) with the target native speaker level produced by the teacher in line 6 (you know how to fight with your hands?). We also see the learner producing, with the teacher's help, utterances which are moving up the scale in line 5 (I fight ...

my hand) and line 7 (I fight with my hand). There is some evidence, then, of learner noticing and uptake of the embedded correction/scaffolding/recast in this case.

So from the perspectives of SLA psycholinguistic theory, L1 acquisition studies and Vygotskian social constructivist theory there is agreement that such sequences are beneficial. A CA analysis demonstrates the same point. The distinctive CA contribution is to show how learning is constructed by the use of interactional resources and to explicate the progress of their learning and their intersubjectivity. In the case of Extract 1, then, a sociocultural theory CA analysis reveals a sequence including a ZPD and scaffolding.

In the analysis of Extract 1 we also noted that L2 classroom interaction can focus simultaneously on linguistic form and on meaning. Seedhouse suggests that L2 classroom interaction has a unique property, namely that language has a dual role as it is both the vehicle and object of instruction (2004: 183). This means that there is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction and this relationship is the foundation of the interactional architecture of the language classroom. In the extracts below we focus on the complex and ever-shifting relationship between linguistic form and meaning in the L2 classroom and consider whether concepts such as the ZPD, which are derived from L1 instruction, are able to do justice to this complexity. In Extract 2, the learners are talking about what they had done the previous weekend. The setting is a language school in England.

[C]*Extract 2*

[NT]

1 L1: and what did you do last weekend?

2 L2: on Saturday I went on my own to Canterbury, so I took a bus

3 and I met L6 (.) he took the same bus to Canterbury. and in
4 Canterbury I visited the Cathedral and all the streets near
5 the Cathedral and I tried to find a pub where you don't see
6 (.) where you don't see many tourists. and I find one
7 T: found
8 L2: I found one where I spoke with two English women and we
9 spoke about life in Canterbury or things and after I came
10 back
11 T: afterwards
12 L2: afterwards I came back by bus too. and on Sunday what did
13 you do?
14 L1: oh, er, I stayed in home
15 T: at home
16 L1: on Sunday I stayed at home and watched the Wimbledon Final.
17 what did you do on Sunday?

(Mathers 1990: 109)

[NT end]

The focus in Extract 2 is on personal meaning in that the learners are able to nominate and contribute new information concerning their personal experiences, and on fluency in that they are able to manage the interaction locally and by themselves. The evidence for this is that the learners use a *current speaker selects next speaker* technique to select another student in lines 12 and 16. The focus is also on accuracy and linguistic form in that the teacher corrects all errors of linguistic form, and in this extract the learners display uptake of the corrected forms in subsequent utterances. Although the teacher adopts a direct and overt repair technique which has a linguistic

upgrading and scaffolding function, this does not result in the flow of the interaction being interrupted.

How does the teacher achieve this unobtrusive repair? According to Iles (1996), experienced teachers often engage in what she terms *camouflaging of repair*. This plays down the activity of repair so that it is less obtrusive and prominent, with the result that the flow of the interaction is not impeded. Some of the features of camouflage are as follows: the teacher produces the target form for adoption by the learner without any overt or explicit negative evaluation or indication that an error has been made. The teacher does not mark the target form out by loudness or decrease in tempo; there is narrow pitch movement and a lack of speech perturbation features. In other words, the teacher fits the repair as unobtrusively as possible into the prosodic environment of the learner's utterances so that the repair does not obtain prominence and does not become the interactional business. The correction can be treated as a by-the-way activity, and the interactional evidence is that the learners do treat it as a by-the-way activity, in that the corrections do not interrupt the flow of the interaction, with one exception. T's repair in line 15 causes L1 to backtrack in line 16 in order to form a linguistically complete sentence. However, this is a minor interruption of the interactional flow.

In Extract 2, then, we can see how a focus on both form and meaning is maintained by the teacher's employment of an unusual and specialized correction technique. The extract also illustrates the unique nature of L2 classroom interaction; in this case two interactants are having a seemingly 'everyday' conversation focused on meaning, whilst the only contribution of the teacher is to provide correction of errors of form. We can also note that there is clear evidence in Extract 2 of successful scaffolding by the teacher and of a ZPD in Ohta's (2001) terms, in that we can see a

clear juxtaposition of actual developmental level with that achieved through collaboration with the teacher.

In the following extract a group of learners of mixed nationalities in New Zealand are discussing which of four potential recipients should receive a heart transplant. They are managing the interaction themselves and focus primarily on meaning and fluency until a problem with linguistic form impacts on communication in line 4.

[C]*Extract 3*

[NT]

- 1 L3: they live in Australia the family?
- 2 L1: () I don't know but they will go to Australia too. (.)
- 3 L3: (1.0) okay
- 4 → L1: (.) and (3.0) another one for () from drug (k^m'pa:ni)
- 5 L2: sorry?
- 6 L1: from drug (k^m'pa:ni) (laughs)
- 7 L2: drug
- 8 L1: drug drug <d-r-u-g> (spells word) the uh drug (k^m'pa:ni)
- 9 L2: what what is (k^m'pa:ni)?
- 10 L1: (k^m'pa:ni)
- 11 L2: (k^m'pa:ni)
- 12 L1: (k^m'pa:ni)
- 13 → L2: (1.0) ah (' k^mpəni)
- 14 L1: yes (' k^mpəni)

- 15 L2: ah (.) from the drug (' k^mpəni)
- 16 L1: drug drug drug
- 17 L2: yes but impossible for the parents to get ()
- 18 L1: drug (k^m'pɑ:ni) know they know about this advertising (.)
- 19 so they will come to help this family this family (2.0) you
know what I mean=
- 20 L2: =no=
- 21 L1: =drug (k^m'pɑ:ni)
- 22 T: → >can can I just right there-< it's (' k^mpəni)
- 23 L1: (' k^mpəni)=
- 24 T: =(' k^mpəni)=
- 25 L1: =(' k^mpəni)=
- 26 T: =(' k^mpəni) yeah=
- 27 L1: =yep=
- 28 T: =yeah not (k^m'pɑ:ni) (' k^mpəni)
- 29 L1: (' k^mpəni)
- (16 lines omitted)
- 46 L1: reasons against giving her a new heart, (1.0) uh (1.5) you
- 47 remember → drug (' k^mpəni) () family allowed drug
(' k^mpəni) give them money

(Loewen 2002 (5 December C12))

[NT end]

In Extract 3 a problem with linguistic form (mispronunciation of *company* with stress on the second syllable) causes a problem in communication for the learners which

necessitates an incidental switch to a focus on linguistic form in lines 5 to 16. It is evident in line 9 that L1's mispronunciation has created a communication problem for L2. First of all, L1 and L2 jointly manage the repair without the help of the teacher, who is present. L2 initiates self-repair in line 9, then conducts other-initiated other-repair in line 13, with L1 displaying uptake of the repair in line 14. In line 17 the learners return to the meaning focus. However, although L1 was able to display uptake of the repaired item when the focus was on form (line 14), he reverts to the incorrect pronunciation (lines 18 and 21) when the focus shifts back to meaning and fluency. In line 22 T switches the focus back to form with other-initiated other-repair and L1 again displays uptake in lines 23 and 25. Subsequently, when the focus again shifts back to meaning and fluency, we find that L1 is now able to display uptake of the corrected item in lines 46-47. This extract is interesting in that L1 does not display continued uptake of a correction of linguistic form when performed by a peer, but does do so when it is performed by the teacher. Again, there is evidence of scaffolding in a ZPD in that we can see a clear juxtaposition of actual developmental level with that achieved through collaboration with the teacher.

The above extract demonstrates the fluidity of the interaction, with the focus switching instantly between form and meaning. It also demonstrates the importance of a contextual approach to repair (Seedhouse 2004: 142); a learner may be able to produce a linguistic item appropriately in one context but not in another. Uptake, then, cannot be demonstrated by repetition of an item in a form and accuracy context. Evidence of uptake is more convincing when a learner is able to produce the item independently when the focus is on meaning and fluency.

L2 classroom interaction involves a number of rather peculiar interactional sequences which are generated by the unique property (language as object and

vehicle) and which need to be accounted for by any model of learning. In Extract 4 below we see a very strange teaching and learning sequence in which the teacher creates a ‘fake’ pedagogical focus; the real focus is camouflaged.

[C]*Extract 4*

[NT]

- 1 T: good, um: (.) Driss, could you please repeat after me OK,
 (T speaks inaudibly)
- 2 L1: I don't understand (laughs)
- 3 T: don't you? repeat after me (T speaks inaudibly)
- 4 L1: more loud please hhh
- 5 T: pardon?
- 6 L1: (.) .hh I don't understand,
- 7 T: don't you? listen again, listen [again](inaudible)
- 8 L1: [what-] what are you saying?
- 9 T: (speaks inaudibly)
- 10 L1: I: hh [.hh]
- 11 T: [don]'t understand me?
- 12 L1: I hhh don't understand (looks perplexed)
- 13 T: oh that's terrible. I'll try Wafaa, Wafaa repeat after me
 repeat after me (T speaks inaudibly)
- 14 L2: I don't hear you.
- 15 T: no? (.) so what do you say?
- 16 L2: (1.0) I beg your pardon but I don't understand
- 17 T: I see, and what do you say then

18 LL: you say () you say could you () could you please ()

19 T: Mrs Khadraoui has got a good one here. Listen,

20 L4: yes, could you please er speak loudly?

21 T: pardon, would you mind repeating that please?

22 L4: could you please er (.) speak clearly and loudly?

23 T: yes of course Mrs Khadraoui, do excuse me. Yes (.) ↑OK and

24 erm (.) could you then write this on the board for me please. if you

write this in your books please, OK? (T

25 writes in tiny, unreadable script; LL look perplexed)

26 L: (2.5) oh no

27 L: (2.0) we don't understand

28 L: we can't write anything

29 L: we can't

30 L: yes

31 L: please would you mind () er writing ()

32 T: listen, let's listen to Boujemaa- oh, she's got fantastic

eyes hasn't she?

33 LL: (laugh)

34 L5: please er would you er: er mind writing er: more clearly?

35 T: certainly. excuse me. (T writes in large letters)

(8 lines omitted)

43 T: OK er-, you've just been asking me to do things. (.) you've

44 just been asking me to do things. (6 lines omitted) OK I've

got a cassette here I'd like you to listen to (.) now I

45 just want you to tell me (.) what the people say when they

(British Council 1985, Volume 2: 17)

[NT]

What the teacher is doing in the above extract is creating situations in which the learners have to make polite requests. This is stated explicitly in an interview with the teacher on the video:

[ext]

I'm going to: start off by putting them in a position where they need to make requests, er: the reason for doing this (.) is partly to find out how much they already know. (.) and also to see which structures they- they would choose to use.

(British Council 1985 Volume 2: 17)

[ext end]

The 'fake' pedagogical focus is for learners to repeat after the teacher (line 1) and copy the teacher's writing (line 25). The camouflaged real focus is for the learners to make requests to the teacher. However, he does not target particular linguistic forms, and in fact he says in the interview quoted above that he is interested in seeing which linguistic forms they use to carry out the function of requesting. Any linguistic forms which perform the function of polite requests would be acceptable, but the string must be correctly formed. It is clear from the teacher's repair initiations in lines 5, 15, 17 and 21 that the teacher is not accepting utterances on the basis of their communicative value; he keeps initiating repair until a learner produces the request function in a linguistically correct format. In the above extract the teacher's unusual behaviour flouts the norms of L2 classroom interaction and thereby creates a situation in which

the learners feel the need to perform a communicative function (request) and must package the function in linguistically correct forms in order to do so.

The above extract also shows that an adequate model of instructed L2 learning must be able to portray the complex and sometimes eccentric relationship between pedagogical focus and patterns of interaction. Extracts 1 to 3 are of course convenient for a Vygotskian model of learning in that we can see evidence of juxtaposition between two levels of language development combined with teacher scaffolding. However, there are many different aspects to language learning and many possible approaches to language teaching. We should not limit ourselves to data which match neatly to a particular model of learning. Rather, we should consider a wide variety of data and be particularly interested in deviant cases such as Extract 4 above since these are particularly illuminating; as Heritage (1995: 399) puts it, deviant cases often serve to demonstrate the normativity of practices.

The unique property of L2 classroom interaction also means that two (or more) different languages are often used by the participants. Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) suggest that code-switching in L2 classrooms is orderly and related to the evolution of pedagogical focus and sequence. Through their language choice, learners may display their alignment or misalignment with the teacher's pedagogical focus. This therefore creates an additional level of complexity which needs to be accounted for in our modelling of language learning processes.

[C]*Extract 5*

[NT]

1 T: Ayvalık here

2 (0.5)

3 so twenty

4 (0.5)

5 twenty

6 (0.5)

7 twenty good persuaders

8 L5: thank you

9 T: persuade?

10 (0.5)

11 what was persuade?

12 L5: → *ikna =etmek*
 [tr: to persuade]

13 T: =/ /good* sell of people okay, wonderful .hh this

14 time go back to your original partner

15 (0.5)

16 original?

17 L2: =/ /*gerçek*
 [tr: real]

18 L5: =/ /*ilk*
 [tr: the first]

19 L7: =*orjinal*
 [tr: original]

20 T: → yeah *ilk partnerinize geri dönüyorsunuz (.) beraber*
 yazdığınız

21 [tr: return to your first partner with whom you have
 written]

((LL talk in English in groups))

(7 minutes)

(Üstünel and Seedhouse 2005: 315)

[NT end]

Extract 5 above is taken from a post-task activity. In lines 1 and 7, the teacher comments on the task results. In lines 9, 11 and 16 the teacher initiates question turns that 'induce' the learners to code-switch, but she does not code-switch to Turkish herself. In line 12, S5 switches to the L1 to provide a translation of the L2 word and in lines 17, 18 and 19 three learners provide translations in the L1 of the L2 word 'original'. These learner turns display the learners' analysis of the teacher's pedagogical focus as being for them to CS to the L1. The teacher's follow-up turn in lines 13 and 20 provides positive feedback, which confirms that the learners had complied with the pedagogical focus. The data contain many such examples. In Extract 5 the teacher's utterance in the L2 has the pedagogical aim of the learners producing an utterance in the L1. The learners display affiliation to the teacher's pedagogical focus precisely by replying in the L1 and the teacher recognizes them as affiliative responses. Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) suggest that it is only possible to understand and analyse code-switching in L2 classrooms by tracing how language choice relates to developments in sequence and the shifting pedagogical focus.

[A]Conclusions

We have seen from the analysis that CA is able to illuminate some aspects of the relationship between interaction and language learning by revealing how learning is constructed by the use of interactional resources and by explicating the progress of

their learning and intersubjectivity. In particular, the sociocultural theory approach to CA is able to provide some evidence of how SC concepts such as the ZPD and scaffolding might be actualized in L2 classroom interaction. This in turn provides a basis for developing a closer relationship between CA and SC.

However, an ethnomethodological approach to CA would point out that it is only relevant to invoke constructs when it is evident in the details of the interaction that the participants themselves are orienting to such constructs; there is no such evidence in the data we have seen above. From this perspective, linking learning theories to interaction is an inherently *etic* undertaking.

One possible criticism of current approaches to conceptualizing the ZPD in L2 learning is that it provides a ‘pre-fabricated’ relationship between learning and interaction which derives from L1 contexts and which fails to incorporate the unique property of L2 classroom interaction; that is, that language is both the vehicle and object of instruction. The analyses presented above have stressed the complex, fluid interplay between form and meaning, interaction and pedagogical focus; participants are orienting to multiple simultaneous concerns and code-switching may be relevant to the learning process. The other chapters in this section present interaction involving L2 learners in a similar light. In order to fully understand how instructed L2 learning occurs in classroom interaction, it will be necessary to portray the interaction holistically with the full multi-layered complexity of language use. Schegloff speaks of ‘the embeddedness, the inextricable intertwinedness, of cognition and interaction’ (1991: 152), which we might visualize as two intertwined strands. The problem with L2 classroom interaction is that a third strand is intertwined, namely language as object of the interaction. This creates an additional level of complexity, as we have seen in the analyses of extracts above. Our constructs and models need, therefore, to

have this third strand built into them. Constructs such as the ZPD, then, would need considerable development to be able to cope with the unique property of L2 classroom interaction and the same point could hypothetically be made in relation to any construct which does not take as its starting point this unique property. So one possible future direction for sociocultural CA would be to develop the ZPD construct to incorporate the unique properties of L2 classroom interaction, the reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction, and the use of multiple languages.

[A]Notes

¹ See below for definitions of emic and etic.

² See, however, Hatch, 1978a.

[ch. end]